



PATENT
100647-09220

1751\$

#6
3-21-03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants : Niu et al.
Serial No. : 09/988,973
Filed : November 20, 2001
For : **METHODS FOR PREPARING POLYVINYLIDENE
FLUORIDE COMPOSITES**
Group Art Unit : 1751
Examiner : Mark T. Kopec

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being deposited with the United States
Postal Service as first class mail in an
envelope addressed to:
Assistant Commissioner for Patents,
Washington, D.C. 20231, on March 5, 2003

Gerard Bilotto, Esq., Reg. No. 51, 474
Name of Applicant, Assignee or Registered
Representative


Signature

March 5, 2003
Date of Signature

RECEIVED
MAR 16 2003
10 1100 MAIL ROOM

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This response is being submitted to the Official Action mailed September 5, 2002
("Official Action") in the above captioned application. A response to this Official Action was
due on October 5, 2002, however, Applicants herewith submit a Petition for a Five Months'
Extension of Time. The five (5) months' extension of time is from October 5, 2002 to March 5,

2003. Under provision 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a)(5), a check in the amount of \$985.00 is enclosed for a small entity. No other fees are believe due for this response, however, the Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. **50-0540**.

The Examiner restricted pending claims 1-7 to Group I and Group II. In response to the Official Action, restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

- I. Claims 1-6 drawn to a process, classified in class 264, subclass 105.
- II. Claims 7, drawn to a composition, classified in class 252, subclass 511.

Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, the Group I claims, namely claims 1-6 and drawn to a process for prosecution on the merits.

It is respectfully requested that the restriction requirement be favorably reconsidered and withdrawn. In view of the fact that the present claims are all related to the same subject matter, it is submitted that a search of the prior art when examining the elected claims of Group I would, at the same time, result in a search of the prior art when examining the remaining claims of Group II. It would seem, then, that to require the filing of a separate divisional application directed to the Group II claims would result in the very same search being repeated, but at a later date. It is submitted that this duplicate search would be quite inefficient to the operation of the Patent and Trademark Office.

Therefore, since a single search can be performed for all Groups of claims without any significant burden on the Patent Office, it is respectfully requested that the restriction requirement be withdrawn.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned regarding this Response or about any other issue. This Response is timely filed and an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Barry Evans, Reg. No. 22,802
Gerard Bilotto, Reg. No. 51,474
919 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022
Phone: (212) 715-9100
Fax: (212) 715-8000